

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JESSE KETZBEAU,

Defendant.

CASE NO: 23-CR-20357

F. KAY BEHM

United States District Judge

CURTIS IVY, JR.

United States Magistrate Judge

**ORDER STRIKING DEFENDANT’S PRO SE MOTIONS
(ECF Nos. 46, 49, 51, 57, 58)**

Before the court are Defendant Ketzbeau’s motions to dismiss and motion for return of property, filed pro se. (ECF Nos. 46, 49, 51, 57, 58). Ketzbeau is currently represented by counsel and, accordingly, his counsel must file any motions on his behalf. *See e.g., United States v. Hamilton*, 2018 WL 10075601, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 11, 2018) (“It is well-established law in the Sixth Circuit that a criminal defendant cannot proceed with hybrid representation, whereby he asserts both the right to proceed pro se and the right to counsel – he must choose one or the other.”). As part of the latitude accorded to district courts to manage their own dockets, courts may bar filings submitted by an individual when that individual is represented by counsel. *See United States v. Agofsky*, 20 F.3d 866,

872 (8th Cir. 1994) (finding no error in the court's refusal to consider pro se motion where defendant was represented by counsel.). Defendant's counsel has indicated that he is not adopting the motions. They are, therefore, **STRICKEN**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 24, 2024

s/F. Kay Behm

F. Kay Behm

United States District Judge